

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this patent application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### ***Comments on Allowable Claims***

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 5-31 and 33-37 contain allowable subject matter. Specifically, claims 5-31 and 33-37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-4 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0183854 to Kato *et al.* (hereinafter “Kato”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,174 to Nakano (hereinafter “Nakano”). Applicants traverse the rejection with respect to these claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and the claims that depend from it, are allowable over the cited combination for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Among other things, claim 1 recites “a thickness of the channel regions of the film transistors are different from each other.” The Office Action asserts that “Kato *et al.* discloses a semiconductor device, . . . where in Fig. 16a, P-channel TFT 501 has a different dimension than the N-channel TFT 502.” The Office Action then asserts that Kato “fails to disclose the required thickness of the two different channel dimension TFT, and the active structure.” However, Kato does not disclose different thicknesses of the channel regions. At best, Kato discloses that the

channel region widths are different. *See* Kato, paragraph 189. There is no disclosure in Kato of TFT channel regions with different thicknesses from each other.

Further, Nakano fails to remedy this deficiency of Kato. Nakano contains no disclosure of TFT channel regions with different thicknesses from each other. At best Nakano discloses different lengths and widths of the channel. *See, e.g.*, Nakano, col. 11, lines 43-46. Further, the Nakano references numbers noted in the Office Action (318a, 318b, 304, and 518) do not address the thickness of the channel. Indeed, reference numeral 518 is not even found in the Nakano reference.

Therefore, for at least this reason, both Kato and Nakano, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose every element of the claims. Thus, claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims passed to issuance.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-37 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 15, 2004

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP/JDL/jeh